



**COMMISSION on COLLEGIATE
INTERPRETER EDUCATION**

Accreditation Manual

March 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		3
CHAPTER 1:	OVERVIEW	5
CHAPTER 2:	ACCREDITATION PROCESS	8
CHAPTER 3:	REVIEW PROCESS	11
CHAPTER 4:	ACCREDITATION CATEGORIES	12
CHAPTER 5:	REPORTS	15
CHAPTER 6:	APPEALS PROCESS	18
CHAPTER 7:	ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES	19
CHAPTER 8:	FEES	22
CHAPTER 9:	CONFLICT OF INTEREST	23

PREFACE

The *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE) Accreditation Manual* reflects the work of many individuals covering decades of development. In addition to the scores of Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT) members involved over the years, this current CCIE Accreditation Manual has drawn from a large number of resources, all available in the public domain.

The original development of the 1995 CIT National Interpreter Accreditation Standards and draft of an Accreditation Manual was completed under the guidance of and consultation with Martha O'Connor, Director of Examination Development of the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy, Inc.

The current CCIE Accreditation Manual combines a selection and adaptation of the best of the policies, processes, and procedures of accrediting organizations in other disciplines. Its structure and content reflect the criteria for recognition by the Association of Specialized Program Accreditors (ASPA), the U.S. Department of Education, and the Council on Higher Education Accreditation. Although two (2) organizations that most heavily influenced this document were the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) and the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER), numerous other agencies were studied and interviewed. While it is no longer possible to tie each component back to its original source of inspiration, the agencies who enlightened this work are gratefully acknowledged below for the generous sharing of their staff time and program materials which contributed to the development of the CCIE Accreditation Manual and accreditation process:

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International)
Web: <http://www.aacsb.edu>

Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA)
Web: <http://www.arc-pa.org>

Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC)
Web: <http://www.ku.edu/~acejmc>

Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education
Web: <http://www.aamft.org>

American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA)
Web: <http://www.aota.org>

Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE)
Web: <http://www.aota.org/Educate/Accredit.aspx>

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)
Web: <http://www.asha.org/>

Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
Web: <http://www.asha.org/about/academia/accreditation>

Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE)
Web: <http://apta.org/capte>

American Physical Therapy Association (APTA)
Web: <http://www.apta.org>

Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP)
Web: <http://www.caahep.org>

Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE), Commission on Standards and Accreditation

Web: <http://www.core-rehab.org>

Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)

Web: <http://www.aacn.nche.edu/accreditation>

Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER)

Web: <http://www.fider.org>

National Association of Schools of Dance (NASD)

Web: <http://www.arts-accredit.org>

National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)

Web: <http://www.arts-accredit.org>

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

Web: <http://ncate.org>

National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission, Inc. (NLNAC)

Web: <http://www.nlnac.org>

Society of American Foresters (SAF)

Web: <http://www.safnet.org>

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

Web: <http://www.teac.org>

"Postsecondary accreditation is a process by which an institution or a specialized unit of postsecondary education periodically evaluates its educational activities and seeks an independent judgment by peers that it achieves substantially its own objectives and meets the established standards of the body by which it seeks accreditation. Generally, the accreditation process involves: (1) a clear statement of the institution's or unit's educational objectives; (2) a self-study by the institution or unit which examines its activities in relation to those objectives; (3) an onsite evaluation by a selected group of peers which reports to the accrediting body; and (4) a decision by this independent body that the institution or unit does or does not meet its standards for accreditation" (Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, Committee on Recognition, 1981).

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW

HISTORY

The Conference of Interpreter Trainers (CIT), after nearly two decades of preparation, established the Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE) in July 2006 as an independent body to support and maintain standards, to promote excellence and to provide accreditation to higher education degree programs in interpretation. The *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards* (formerly known as the National Interpreter Education Standards, CIT, adopted 1995) are the cornerstone of the accreditation structure and process. The establishment of an independent commission on accreditation is a national expression of support for the essential principles and values of interpreter education, including:

- Respect and support for deaf people's right to self-determination and effective communication access;
- Education that produces graduates who are effective professionals, critical thinkers, and socially responsible citizens as reflected in the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards*;
- Commitment to ongoing improvement in the quality of education for interpreters working with American Sign Language and English (including English-influenced forms of signing);
- Conduct that fosters confidence in the accreditation system process, the commission, and the professionalism exhibited by the field;
- Inclusion of diverse peoples, perspectives, and opinions; and
- Support of students, graduates, and faculty in the pursuit of life-long learning.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

The CCIE accredits programs within institutions of higher education that grant degrees in signed language interpreter education at the Associate's and/or Bachelor's, degree level in the United States, its territories, and Canada. These programs must demonstrate compliance with the CCIE *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards*.

Accreditation is a system for recognizing educational institutions and professional programs for a level of performance, integrity, and quality that entitles them to the confidence of the educational community and the public audiences served. In the United States, unlike in most other countries, this recognition is extended primarily through nongovernmental, voluntary institutional or professional associations.

With the establishment of and implementation of a national accreditation program, interpreter education joins the many disciplines and institutions involved in this collegial, self-regulatory process of quality assurance. Accreditation serves a number of important functions, including encouraging maximum educational effectiveness. In brief, the goal of the accreditation process is for a program to objectively evaluate its educational activities, resources, and outcomes and for the accrediting body to then provide external, independent opinion to validate the program's findings. The process has four (4) main parts:

1. A directed self-study assessing the program's success in achieving its stated mission;
2. Submission of a Self-Study Report for peer review;
3. An onsite evaluation by peers; and
4. A determination of accreditation status (grant or deny) by the CCIE commissioners.

The CCIE accreditation will strive to:

1. Stimulate and support continuous, critical self-analysis and enhancement of interpreter education programs by faculty, administration, students, and governing departments, with the goal of assuring quality education for students and quality interpretation services to the public;
2. Determine whether interpreter education programs are in compliance with the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards (CCIE Accreditation Standards)*;
3. Encourage faculty to anticipate and incorporate new research, technology, pedagogical trends and developments that should be incorporated into the educational process; and
4. Assure stakeholders, including the educational community, professional organizations and agencies, and the public, that programs have a clearly defined and appropriate mission, provide an environment supportive of the mission, demonstrate accomplishment, and show promise of continuing success.

AUTHORITY AND AUTONOMY

The U.S. Department of Education (DOE), the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) require that accrediting commissions be autonomous in decision-making from any parent or sponsoring entity and not subject to approval or disapproval by its parent or other organizations' boards or membership. Accordingly, the Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education (CCIE) conducts all aspects of its accreditation activities, including, but not limited to the establishment of bylaws, standards, policies, operating rules and procedures; control of its financial affairs; implementation of its operating rules and procedures; selection of members, officers, committee members, evaluators, and consultants; and the independent administration of its own affairs.

The mission of CCIE is to evaluate and accredit postsecondary interpreter education program throughout the United States, its territories, and Canada. The CCIE has sole authority and accountability for carrying out the responsibilities inherent in the accreditation process. Specifically, the CCIE:

- Promulgates established *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards* and criteria for the accreditation of interpreter education programs that lead to an Associate's or Bachelor's degree;
- Promotes program participation in the accreditation process;
- Develops and publishes policies and procedures that lead to and follow up on accreditation actions, including those that promote ongoing programmatic self-analysis and planned strategies for innovation and improvement, onsite review, the CCIE decision-making process, non-conflict of interest, and a fair appeals process;
- Conducts the accreditation process and receives applications, determines eligibility, assists programs involved in self-study review, appoints and trains qualified peer evaluators, facilitates

the Self-Study Report review and onsite visits, and confers or denies accreditation based on reports of the peer review;

- Determines a reasonable fee schedule and identifies sources of revenue which will assure fiscal viability of the CCIE;
- Implements procedures to maintain and encourage involvement of higher education professionals and the public in decision-making, policy setting, and updating the *Standards*; and to receive and respond to legitimate public concerns and criticism;
- Continually monitors its own performance to assure adequate resources to accomplish its accreditation mission, examine its impact on programs, and conduct periodic self-reviews in cooperation with accreditation colleagues.

RECOGNITION

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) is an independent, non-governmental organization responsible for overseeing accreditation agencies to assure the quality of accreditation practices. CHEA has established a set of criteria and provisions for the evaluation and recognition of accrediting agencies.

The CCIE operational policies and procedures are developed in accordance with CHEA and U.S. Department of Education criteria so that recognition may be pursued if deemed desirable.

CHAPTER 2: ACCREDITATION PROCESS

CANDIDACY

Any interpreter education program wishing to begin the accreditation process must submit a completed Application for Candidacy with all supporting materials (see below), and a one-time, non-refundable Application Fee to the CCIE. The Executive Committee will review the submitted materials to determine if the program is sufficiently prepared to begin the self-study review process. The President or the Operations Manager, should one be appointed contacts the program to let them know that the self-study review process may begin.

It is important to note that Candidacy is not an accreditation status, and may not be advertised as such. Candidacy does not guarantee eventual accreditation.

ORDER OF ACCREDITATION PROCESS

1. Application for Candidacy
2. Self-study Review: Commences upon acceptance of Candidacy
3. Submission of the Self-Study Report (SSR): Within one year of acceptance of Candidacy
4. SSR Review by CCIE: Completed by the Accreditation Team with final approval given by the full commission.
5. Site Visit: If recommended, will be scheduled by the Accreditation Team and the program, typically during the academic year following receipt of SSR
6. CCIE Accreditation Action: Usually within 60 days following receipt of Site Visit Report

APPLICATION FOR CANDIDACY

The completion of the CCIE Application for Candidacy constitutes a declaration of intent on the part of the sponsoring institution for the interpreter education program to begin the process of accreditation with the CCIE. The interpreter education program must offer a degree(s) at the associate or bachelor level, be housed in a nationally accredited institution, offer a practicum and/or internship, and have graduated at least three classes. The application form includes:

- Name of the applicant program;
- Institutional data, such as degrees offered and institutional accreditation;
- Program data, such as name of the program coordinator and department chair, number of full and part-time faculty, length of program, practicum, individual(s) coordinating the SSR, etc; and
- A Signature page.

THE SELF-STUDY REVIEW PROCESS

Self-study is the heart and soul of the accreditation process. The self-study review refers to a formal process during which an interpreter education program critically examines its structure and substance, judges the program's overall effectiveness relative to its mission, identifies specific strengths and weaknesses, and indicates a plan for necessary modifications and improvements. The process should flow naturally out of the ongoing program evaluation. It should include consideration of external factors influencing educational directions as well as an assessment of the extent to which the program is in compliance with the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards*.

The self-study review is designed to address several questions in relation to the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*:

- What are the program's mission, goals, and objectives? Are they consistent with the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution? Are they appropriate to the current time, circumstances, and constituencies?
- Is the conceptual model on which the curriculum is based (curriculum design) consistent with the mission?
- Are all of the courses (objectives, teaching-learning strategies, evaluative methods) congruent with the curriculum design?
- Is there solid evidence that the objectives of the program are being achieved?
- Are the human, physical, and fiscal resources needed to achieve the program's objectives available now? Are they likely to be available for the foreseeable future?

The self-study process begins approximately one (1) year before the accreditation team reviews the report, providing ample time to evaluate all facets of program operations and to reach conclusions concerning the extent to which the program is in compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*. The process should involve the various constituencies of the program, including administration and faculty, practicum mentors, students, graduates, advisory committee members and employers if possible.

The program may find it useful to appoint several committees, assigning to each the evaluation of aspects of program operations that relate to one or more of the *Standards*. One (1) individual, usually the program director, should serve as the coordinator and resource to the self-study committees. Committee reports, each containing a summary of the findings relative to the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*, including strengths, concerns, and recommendations, should then be used as the basis for the Narrative Section of the Self-Study Report (SSR). Participating programs should anticipate that:

- The self-study process precedes the preparation of the final review report. Although the requirements of the final report should be considered in the plan for the study, the initial focus should be on the evaluative process, not the document.
- The self-study process begins with a well thought-out plan which includes:
 - Objectives;
 - Identification of resources;
 - Individuals to be involved and delegation of responsibilities;
 - Timeline; and
 - Reporting mechanisms.

The plan should address how existing information from ongoing program evaluation will be included and how the self-study process involves the entire faculty of the program. Although it is recognized that a small committee or a single individual is generally assigned responsibility for overseeing the process and the preparation of the report, it is expected that the process include input from all faculty, members, administration, students, graduates, and practicum mentors.

In general, the interpreter education program faculty and staff should review the CCIE documents and requirements before applying for accreditation. It should be recognized that many faculty, staff, students and numerous administrative personnel within the institution would become involved with the self-study process. Considerable time, generally not allocated to such activities, will be devoted to organizing and analyzing data and completing the required document. Therefore, initial planning must provide sufficient time for individuals, groups, or committees to complete their assignments.

The accreditation process constitutes a substantial financial investment by the institution. Faculty time, clerical support, data gathering procedures, and the reproduction of the final review report are only a few of the apparent costs. Financial implications and budget should be considered during the planning.

SELF-STUDY REPORT (SSR)

The Self-Study Report (SSR) is an evidential document, which summarizes the methods and findings of the self-study process. It will follow a particular format, which facilitates the assessment of the program's compliance with the *Standards*. Programs must address each standard by providing specific detail about how the program satisfies the standard. This detail is sometimes in the form of specific documentation (job descriptions, faculty vitae, institutional catalogues, policies, and procedures) and sometimes in narrative form (descriptions of program facilities, assessment of the content of program curriculum, faculty professional development plans and institutional support).

The Self-Study Report (SSR) should be comprehensive, examining in sufficient detail all aspects of the program, so that eventual assessment of compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* by the Accreditation Team can be accomplished. Programs have the opportunity to demonstrate how they satisfy the standards of the profession by providing in-depth self-study reviews to the peer evaluators. The report contains a synopsis of relevant data, conclusions, and plans generated by the study.

The Self-Study Report (SSR) is evaluative rather than descriptive. It should include comments, suggestions for program change, particularly the resolution of current problems or weaknesses, which are cited in the self-study, and predictions or plans for future change.

CHAPTER 3: REVIEW PROCESS

ACCREDITATION TEAMS

Following the policies established for this process, the CCIE will assign each Accreditation Team. An Accreditation Team consists of three (3) members: at least one (1) of which is a Commissioner and one (1) current or former full-time interpreter education program faculty member. Each member must meet the criteria as CCIE raters and agree to abide by the CCIE policies and procedures. Every effort will be made to have a diverse representation of race, ethnicity, geography, and gender on the Accreditation Teams.

INITIAL REVIEW PROCESS

Upon receipt of an SSR, the Accreditation Team will conduct a thorough review of the report within the agreed upon timelines. This review results in a written report following the format prescribed by the CCIE. The team will make a final recommendation to the CCIE whether or not to award a site visit.

Initial Review Outcomes

1. Recommend Onsite Visit

Based on the initial review of the SSR, if the program is in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* an onsite evaluation will be conducted. Programs will be informed of any concerns that need to be addressed during the onsite visit, and the onsite visit will be scheduled.

2. Do Not Recommend Onsite Visit

Based on the initial review of the SSR, if the program is not in adequate compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* to warrant an onsite visit, the program will be provided with the evaluation report explaining areas of non-compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

ONSITE REVIEW PROCESS

If the onsite visit is recommended, the Accreditation Team Leader will work with the other team members and the program to plan the onsite visit. The Accreditation Team will conduct the onsite review addressing specific concerns that may not have been addressed in the SSR. A thorough investigation of all facets of the SSR will be reviewed and verified while the Accreditation Team is onsite. Interviews may be conducted with faculty, staff, administration, current students, alumni, and employers. The visit is typically a few days in length and will take considerable time and energy for the faculty members involved.

Accreditation Team Report

Upon completion of the site visit, the Accreditation Team will conduct an exit interview with the applicant institution's representatives and program faculty, and submit a written report to the CCIE commissioners for final action.

CHAPTER 4: ACCREDITATION CATEGORIES

Following the site visit, the CCIE will make one of the following accreditation decisions.

ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

1. Award Full Accreditation

The program is in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

2. Award Accreditation with Stipulations

The program is not in compliance with one or more of the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* and/or sub-components. Within sixty (60) days of notification, the program will be required to submit a Plan of Correction that addresses areas of non-compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*. All stipulations must be met within two (2) years of approval of Plan of Correction.

Plan of Correction

Whenever deficiencies are identified as a result of a site visit, a Plan of Correction for each deficiency must include:

- A description of the plan for bringing the program into compliance with each *Standard*;
- A projected timeline; and
- A description of the documentation to be submitted to demonstrate compliance.

If progress has been made toward correcting the deficiency, a summary of the progress may also be included. The Plan of Correction should be dated and signed by the program director and the appropriate institution administrator. The Plan of Correction should be submitted to the CCIE within sixty (60) days of receipt the accreditation letter.

The CCIE will take action to ACCEPT or DEFER the Plan. If the CCIE determines that execution of the Plan of Correction is likely to bring the program into compliance with the cited *standard* in a timely manner, the report is ACCEPTED and a due date established for a Progress Report. The program will be notified by the CCIE that the Plan was accepted within thirty (30) days of receipt.

If the CCIE determines that the Plan has inadequately addressed the deficiency or that execution of the Plan is not likely to bring the program into compliance with the cited standard in a timely manner, action on the report is DEFERRED and a due date established for a revised Plan. The program will be notified by the CCIE that the Plan was deferred within thirty (30) days of receipt.

The letter notifying the program director that the Plan of Correction is deferred will specify the reasons why the Plan of Correction was considered inadequate.

Progress Reports

Following acceptance of a Plan of Correction, periodic Progress Reports are required until all deficiencies are corrected. For each deficiency, the report should indicate whether the program believes that the deficiency has been corrected. It should also provide a summary of the progress made toward correcting the deficiency, the documentation that is being submitted and additional action to be taken (if any) with a specific timeline for completion. If no progress has been made toward correcting the deficiency, a statement to that effect should be included.

The Progress Report should be dated and signed by the program director and the appropriate institution administrator. The Progress Report and any attachments should be forwarded to the CCIE

President. The CCIE commissioners will take action on the Report and if deficiencies remain, a due date for an additional report will be established. If a change in status is indicated, the program will be notified of the action.

When the accreditation review process confirms that a program has corrected the identified deficiencies that lead to the stipulations within a reasonable period of time and is in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* and with administrative requirements, the program is awarded full accreditation. If the identified deficiencies are not corrected within a reasonable period of time, usually considered to be no more than two (2) years, the CCIE may grant: a) an Extension of Accreditation with Stipulations or b) determine that the program is denied accreditation.

3. Accreditation Withheld (denied)

Accreditation will be denied if the program is not in compliance with several of the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*; **or**

The program is not in *substantial* compliance with one or more of the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* AND is unable to provide evidence of its ability to effect a satisfactory Plan of Correction within the 60-day timeline.

The program will be removed from the accreditation process when one of the two elements above are determined. Any subsequent review will require that the program re-apply for Candidacy, prepare a new SSR, and pay all fees for accreditation at the time of the subsequent review.

The appropriate official will be provided with a clear statement of each deficiency, and informed that a new application for accreditation may be submitted whenever the program is believed to be in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

4. Administrative Probationary Accreditation

The Administrative Probationary Accreditation status is enforced when a program does not comply with one or more of the following administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation:

- a) Submitting a SSR, a required Plan of Correction, a required Progress Report, or the Biennial Report to the CCIE by the specified due date.
- b) Paying accreditation fees within ninety (90) days after the date of the invoice.
- c) Documenting within ninety (90) days of a new appointment that the program has retained and/or changed key program personnel, as required by the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

The institution and the accredited program will be advised that the program is on Administrative Probationary Accreditation. This status is not subject to appeal; however, during a period of Administrative Probationary Accreditation, programs are recognized and listed as being accredited.

When an accredited program has failed to satisfy the requirements identified in 3.a) – c) above, the CCIE President, after consultation with the entire Commission, notifies the program director and administrators that the program is on Administrative Probationary Accreditation until it has satisfied the CCIE's administrative requirement.

At its next scheduled meeting, the CCIE reviews the probation status and determines if a recommendation for withdrawal of accreditation is merited. If so, the program director and administrators will be notified in writing.

When the administrative issues resulting in this decision have been resolved, the CCIE will allow the program to continue in the accreditation process, or, if the program had already received accreditation, their original status will be reinstated.

ACCREDITATION WITHDRAWAL

Accreditation Withdrawn - Voluntary (at the request of the sponsoring institution)

The appropriate official of a program may at any time inform the CCIE in writing that the program is, or will be, discontinued by a given date or wishes to have Accreditation Withdrawn. The CCIE President acknowledges this notification and will inform the appropriate official that the institution must apply for accreditation as a new candidate. No fees will be returned to the sponsoring institution.

Accreditation Withdrawn - Involuntary (for failure to be in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* or with administrative requirements)

Accreditation may be withdrawn involuntarily from a program with Accreditation with Stipulations or Administrative Probationary Accreditation if the commission confirms that the program is not in substantial compliance with: a) the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* or b) the administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation.

The CCIE will provide the appropriate official with a clear statement of each deficiency and inform the sponsoring institution that it may apply for accreditation as a new applicant whenever the program is believed to be in compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* and with the administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation. A letter from the CCIE notifying the appropriate officials that the program has received Accreditation Withdrawn - Involuntary indicates that the institution may appeal the decision.

Students enrolled in the program at the time the sponsoring institution is notified that accreditation has been withdrawn may complete the requirements for graduation and will be considered graduates of a CCIE accredited program.

CHAPTER 5: REPORTS

BIENNIAL REPORTS

Accredited interpreter education programs are required to submit a Biennial Report to the CCIE. The purpose of the Biennial Report to the CCIE is to facilitate ongoing monitoring of programs in the interval between onsite evaluations. Questions are designed to elicit self-evaluation of continuing compliance with each standard. For maximum benefit to the program, the report should be discussed by the entire program faculty and should be incorporated into, or flow directly from, a program's ongoing evaluation.

The Biennial Report is due to the CCIE by June 30 of every other year, beginning two years after full accreditation is awarded. The CCIE commissioners reviews the Biennial Reports. Actions taken by the CCIE may include:

1. Acceptance of the report with no further action required by the program.
2. Deferral of action on the report with a request for clarification of one or more items. Following receipt of the follow-up information, the CCIE Board will act upon the report a second time.
3. Acceptance of the report with a request for a Plan of Correction regarding one or more deficiencies (areas of non-compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*).

SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE REPORTS

The CCIE should be notified of any substantive changes to the program as described below.

1. Faculty Changes

A requirement for maintaining accreditation is prompt notification to the CCIE if the faculty of an accredited interpreter education program changes significantly. Significant changes in faculty include the addition, loss, or change of a full-time faculty member. The program will need to demonstrate that the faculty changes and new faculty qualifications are in compliance with and satisfy the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

2. Program Changes

Significant program changes include adding, changing, or significantly altering courses in the curriculum, changes in facilities, and/or institutional support. The program will need to demonstrate that the changes are in compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.

3. Program Director Changes

The change of a program director can have a significant impact on a program. Any changes in this position, or the criteria for the position, need to be immediately reported to the CCIE. If the position is vacant, written notification should include the plan for filling the position.

If the position has been filled by an acting or permanent program director, written notification should include the following documentation:

- a) The name, credentials, title, and effective date of appointment of the new program director.
- b) The program director's curriculum vitae. The curriculum vitae should detail interpreting experience and credentials, giving particular attention to experience and qualifications in academic teaching and administration. It is also helpful to the CCIE if the program director provides a summary of experience and qualifications that are pertinent to the *CCIE Accreditation Standards*.
- c) A statement concerning the program director's equivalent educational qualifications, if the master's or doctoral degree has not been obtained.

4. Changes in Program Delivery / Instructional Method or Modality

Accredited programs wishing to change the accredited instructional method or add a new instructional method e.g., distance education, must submit a Substantive Change Report to the commission prior to implementing or advertising the change in modality. Failure to do so will jeopardize the program's accreditation status.

The Change in Program Delivery / Instructional Method or Modality Substantive Change Report must include:

- Section A: Description of proposed delivery system, instructional methods, and timeline for implementation.
- Section B: Description of proposed facility (including faculty, staff, administration, facilities, and technological resources) related to proposed instructional methods.
- Section C: Identification of proposed geographic location of all students, faculty, staff, and administrative / staff support.
- Section D: Description of proposed field experience.
- Section E: List of all proposed courses offered and method of delivery used for each. (Include a virtual tour if possible)

Upon receipt of this Substantive Change Report, the Commission will review it and determine if the proposed changes reflect a change in instructional method or modality or if they represent an entirely new program. Programs offering new instructional delivery methods or modalities that maintain the same program director, faculty, curriculum, processes and standards as the initially accredited program are typically considered a change in instructional method. Changes to program directorship, faculty, curriculum, processes or standards are typically viewed as entirely new programs subject to the standard accreditation process.

Commission Actions

Action 1: The Commission may accept the Substantive Change Report, and the program will continue with its current accreditation status.

Action 2: The Commission may request additional information.

Action 3: The Commission may reject the Substantive Change Report. This action confers that the information presented in the Substantive Change Report constitutes a new program entirely. If this determination is made, the program will be subject to the standard accreditation process.

FAILURE TO SUBMIT REPORTS

A requirement for maintaining accreditation is to submit all required reports by the due date specified by the CCIE. Timely submission of accreditation reports is critical to provide adequate review time prior to the CCIE action. The CCIE has established the following procedures regarding the failure to submit accreditation reports by the specified due date:

1. A due date is established for each accreditation report and provided to the program in writing.
2. When an accreditation report is not received by the specified due date, a late fee is charged and a warning letter is sent to the program director (with a copy to the institution's administration), stating that the report must be received within fifteen (15) working days of the due date or the program will be placed on Administrative Probationary Accreditation (see above).

- a) If a report is received before the end of the 15-day grace period, receipt of the report is acknowledged by the CCIE and the report is reviewed by the CCIE at the next scheduled meeting.
- b) If a report is not received by 5:00 PM on day fifteen (15) of the grace period, the program will be placed on Administrative Probationary Accreditation. Once a delinquent report is received, it is acknowledged by the CCIE and the Administrative Probationary Accreditation status is removed. Any applicable late fees are still assessed.

CHAPTER 6: APPEALS PROCESS

APPEALS GENERAL POLICY

Only programs denied accreditation can appeal. A program may only appeal upon the grounds that the decision of the accreditation commission to deny accreditation or reaccreditation was inappropriate because of: a) errors of fact or b) failure to conform to the CCIE's published criteria, policies, and/or procedures. Only conditions up to and including the time of the CCIE's decision that were known to the CCIE will be considered in an appeal.

Upon receipt of the notice of appeal, the CCIE will send the program an Appeals Form to use for response to the CCIE's report of the reasons why a non-accreditation determination was made. The program must respond to the report. Information relevant to an appeals hearing will consist of that evidence presented to the CCIE with regard to the conditions that existed at the time of submission of the non-accreditation action. Evidentiary matters not included in the record shall not be introduced. The program will also receive an invoice for the Appeals Fee; this fee must be paid in full before the CCIE will consider the appeal. The Appeals Form and Fee payment must be submitted within thirty (30) days of receipt of the form.

Composition of an Appeals Panel

An Appeals Hearing Panel consists of three (3) individuals who are familiar with the accreditation process, who have a working knowledge of the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards*, and who are familiar with the administration and functional components of the specific type of institution sponsoring the educational program under review, (e.g., community college, university). Every effort will be made to ensure diversity in panel composition.

A list of five (5) individuals qualified to serve as members of an Appeals Hearing Panel shall be prepared in consultation with the CCIE Board of Commissioners. The list shall be sent to the institution within twenty (20) days of the CCIE's receipt of the request for appeal. Within ten (10) days of receipt of the list, the institution shall select three (3) individuals from the list to constitute the Appeals Hearing Panel and shall notify the CCIE of the names of the persons selected. No individual is eligible for membership on an Appeals Hearing Panel who is or has been previously involved with the sponsoring institution or the accreditation review activity that led to the specific CCIE action, or who is a current member of the CCIE Board of Commissioners.

Authority of an Appeals Hearing Panel

The Appeals Hearing Panel is charged by the CCIE Board of Commissioners with a review of the policies, procedures, and criteria to arrive at the contested not-to accredit decision, along with determining whether there were any material errors of fact, and with determining whether the CCIE properly applied said policies, procedures, and criteria in making its decision. The Appeals Hearing Panel is not empowered to consider improvements to the program(s) after the CCIE's meeting at which the non-accreditation action was taken. The Appeals Hearing Panel's recommendation will be limited to the options available to the CCIE for the Accreditation Withheld determination. The Appeals Hearing Panel reports its recommendations to the CCIE Board of Commissioners for ratification.

Confidentiality of the Appeals Process

The process and content of the appeal at all stages are confidential matters. The Accreditation Withheld determination will not be made public until the appeal process has been exhausted. If the Appeals Hearing Panel overrules the Accreditation Withheld determination, any such determination is not made public.

CHAPTER 7: ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

Confidentiality and Disclosure

In keeping with its responsibility to the public, the CCIE has clearly delineated policies regarding confidentiality and disclosure.

Statement on Confidentiality

The CCIE maintains the confidentiality of information collected during the accreditation process. Materials such as Applications for Candidacy, Self-Study Reports, Plans of Correction, Progress Reports, Biennial Reports, and requests for appeals to the CCIE are considered confidential and are accessible only to the staff and individuals involved in review of the program. Written permission must be secured from the authorities of the educational institution prior to releasing this information to any other individual or group, except when this released information does not disclose the identity of the educational institution.

During discussions related to review and evaluation of specific programs, strict safeguards of confidentiality are maintained. These meetings are closed and the minutes are kept confidential. Meetings may be open during discussion of general accreditation procedures. During open meetings, participants avoid references to specific programs by name or through elaborate descriptions. Statistical summaries that do not specifically reveal information about individual programs may be disclosed. The CCIE shall not be responsible for attempts to use general information disclosed by the CCIE to identify specific programs.

Statement on Disclosure

The scope, policies, procedures, and decisions of the CCIE are described in official documents and are available to the educational community and the public. Information relevant to decisions on accreditation status will be published in a list of all educational programs accredited by the CCIE.

The scope, policies and procedures of the CCIE are described in official documents and are available to the educational community and the public. Final decisions on accreditation statuses are public information. CCIE will publish lists of accredited programs on its website.

The listing itself does NOT specify which of the three (3) accreditation categories (Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, Administrative Probationary Accreditation) apply to each of the individual programs. Those programs on probation are included in the listing without differentiation from the other accredited programs, since probationary accreditation is an accreditation status.

If inquiries, written or verbal, are received regarding the accreditation status of a program, the inquirer is told whether the program is accredited, the specific accreditation category, and the definition of the applicable accreditation category. The inquirer is referred to the program for additional information as to accreditation.

The public is notified of all newly accredited programs via official approved publications and social media outlets.

Programs are accredited for ten (10) years and must then apply for reaccreditation.

The public will be notified when programs are up for reaccreditation (via official approved publications) to provide an opportunity for written third-party comment concerning the program's qualifications for accreditation. The definitions of the specific categories of accreditation will be presented in the reaccreditation listing follows:

Accreditation:

The program is in substantial compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* and guidelines for an accredited interpreter education program.

Accreditation with Stipulations:

The program is not in substantial compliance with one or more of the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* and guidelines for an accredited interpreter education program.

Administrative Probationary Accreditation:

The program did/does not comply with one or more of the administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation (e.g., paying a fee or filing a report in a timely manner). Programs remaining on Administrative Probationary Accreditation at the time the list is updated will be removed from the listing and will lose their status as accredited programs.

Public Correction of Incorrect or Misleading Statements Regarding Accreditation or Candidacy Status

Public Disclosure

Any institution or program that elects to make a public disclosure of the accreditation or candidacy status of its interpreter education program must accurately disclose the status; the specific academic program covered by that status; and the name, address, and contact information of the accrediting agency.

Any institution or program that elects to make a public disclosure of the results of a CCIE accreditation must accurately disclose:

- Statements from the final report of the CCIE - not the Accreditation Team Report or Initial Review or Final Review; and
- Complete information regarding the CCIE's findings (i.e., strengths, suggestions, deficiencies, and the CCIE's final accreditation action).

Strengths cited in the report may not be published without also publishing any cited suggestions or deficiencies.

Public Correction

Standard 3.A.1 - Fair Practices of the *Commission on Collegiate Interpreter Education Accreditation Standards* requires that all program descriptions, publications, announcements, and advertising must accurately reflect the program offered.

In the case that a program accredited by the CCIE describes the accreditation inaccurately and/or does not include the specific academic program covered by that status and the name and contact information of the accrediting agency, the CCIE may cite a deficiency. To remove the deficiency, the program must then demonstrate compliance with *Standard 3.A.1. Fair Practices*.

If the program is not accredited by the CCIE and fails to make public correction of incorrect or misleading information regarding its accreditation status, the CCIE will publish an article providing correct information to the public in any number of official approved publications.

Communication with Educational Program and Institutional Representatives

Written Communication

In order to prevent problems related to misunderstanding and/or misinformation, it is the policy of the CCIE that all communications regarding the CCIE actions related to accreditation shall be presented through official written correspondence. Such correspondence is sent directly from the CCIE, along with the signature of the CCIE President, and is addressed and copied as follows:

- For CCIE actions that involve or may involve areas of non-compliance with the *CCIE Accreditation Standards* (e.g., deficiencies), letters are addressed to the administration of the institution and copied to the program director.
- For CCIE actions that do not directly affect accreditation status, letters are generally addressed to the program director and copied to the administration.
- Additional written communication related to the procedures and scheduling of the accreditation process is sent directly to the program director from the CCIE President or designee.

Verbal Communication

To facilitate the accreditation process, regular communication with the CCIE is encouraged. Questions related to the self-study review process, preparation of required reports, arrangements for the onsite evaluation, or other procedural issues may be directed at any time to the CCIE Office. Questions regarding clarification of an action or a request from the CCIE may be directed to the CCIE President who will provide a response to the program representative.

While the CCIE will clarify statements in regard to deficiencies or acceptability of reports, it is not the role of the CCIE to provide consultation regarding program development. Questions related to program development or requests for guidance regarding approaches to addressing deficiencies may be directed to independent consultants.

Direct communication between members of the CCIE commission and members of educational program faculty and staff prior to an onsite evaluation visit is appropriate when it is related to specific arrangements for travel or housing for the visit or discussion of the onsite schedule. Direct communication between Accreditation Team members and the program director or faculty is inappropriate in those instances where the communication relates to the substance or appropriateness of a decision of the CCIE.

CHAPTER 8: FEES

Initial Application Fee: A program seeking initial accreditation is required to apply for Candidacy Status, and submit the Application Form along with the Initial Application Fee. The application fee validates the application for a period of two (2) years from the date of receipt by the CCIE office. After two (2) years, a new Application Form must be submitted and the fee paid to maintain applicant status.

Self-study Review Initial Fee: The Self-study Review Initial Fee is due upon notification of Candidacy Status, at which point the self-study officially commences.

Self-Study Report (SSR) Review Fee: The Self-Study Report Review Fee is due upon submission of the Self-Study Report (SSR).

Site Visit Fee: The Site Visit Fee must be paid in full prior to the scheduled Site Visit. An invoice for the Site Visit fee is issued to the program following receipt of the Self-Study Report. The Site Visit fee is charged for all site visits for costs associated with the accreditation process.

Extension Fee: An Extension Fee will be charged should a program deviate from the planned timeline for completion of any part of the process including Biennial Reports. Extensions will be granted for 30 days, with a maximum of two extensions.

Annual Sustaining Fee: Programs awarded accreditation will pay an Annual Sustaining fee in Year Two (2) through Year Ten (10). Programs awarded accreditation without the need for a Plan of Correction will be invoiced in the calendar year after the year initial accreditation is granted. Programs that submit a Plan of Correction to address deficiencies will pay the Annual Sustaining Fee in the first year to cover administrative costs of tracking the program's progress.

Appeals Fee: The Appeals Fee covers the cost of convening the Appeals Panel, should one be needed, and for duplication and distribution of all materials needed by the Appeals Panel.

Late Fee: A late fee will be charged any time a program does not comply with the stated timelines and does not request an extension prior to the due date.

Refunds: Fees are non-refundable.

Please refer to the fee schedule on the CCIE web site for detailed information. Fees are subject to change at any time without notice.

CHAPTER 9: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Service as a CCIE Commissioner or alternate, committee member, Accreditation Team Leader or Member, accreditation consultant, or staff member may create situations that result in conflicts of interest or questions regarding the objectivity and credibility of the accreditation process. The CCIE expects all individuals to behave in a professional and ethical manner, to disclose real or perceived conflicts of interest, and to recuse themselves from discussions or decisions related to real or perceived conflicts of interest. The intent of this policy is to:

- Maintain credibility in the accreditation process and confidence in the decisions of the CCIE commissioners, accreditation committee members, Rater Team members, consultants and staff members;
- Assure fairness and impartiality in decision-making; and
- Act impartially and avoid the appearance of impropriety.

Additional information about Conflict of Interest is detailed in the CCIE Bylaws, Article IX, Section 9.01-9.06.